

1 REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

2 Information Disclosure Statement

3 In considering the patentability of all pending claims, the Examiner is respectfully  
4 requested to consider information that is being cited in an Information Disclosure Statement  
5 (IDS) filed concurrently herewith. The concurrently filed IDS cites the first Japanese Office  
6 Action in the corresponding Japanese Patent Application which claims priority to the current  
7 application in the US. The Japanese office action cited three references as follows: (1) WO  
8 94/17474, (2) Japanese Patent Laying-Open No. 5-151179 and (3) an article entitled "Quota  
9 Manager Managing Directory Capacity for Windows NT" by Noriharu Tanaka, published in  
10 LAN TIMES, Japan, Softbank Corporation, dated April 1, 1997.

11 The Examiner is requested to carefully and thoroughly review information in the  
12 IDS, for relevance to all pending claims in the current patent application. Note that a  
13 concise explanation, of the references being cited, is provided in the Japanese Office Action.

14  
15 Allowable Claims

16 In the Office Action dated July 22, 2008 in the current patent application, Claims 46  
17 and 47 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten. See paragraph 6 on page 9 of the  
18 Office Action. Hence, Claim 46 has been rewritten, and is therefore believed to be in form  
19 for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. Claim 47 depends from  
20 Claim 46 and is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reason as Claim 46.

21 New Claims 58 and 59 are added herewith, based on the limitations in Claims 46 and  
22 47. Accordingly these two new claims are also believed to be in form for allowance.

23 Note that none of the following remarks are applicable to Claims 46, 47, 58 and 59.

24  
25 Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

26 Claims 1, 4-19, 29-34, 36, 38-39, 43, 45 and 48-54 were all rejected under 35 U.S.C.  
27 §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,505,214 (hereinafter "Sherman"). The §102  
28 rejections of Claims 1, 4-19, 29-34, 36, 38-39, 43, 45 and 48-54 are respectfully traversed  
29 herewith.

1 In rejecting Claim 1 the Examiner stated on page 3 of the Office Action, in  
2 paragraph 5 that "Sherman teaches a parent process in said computer checking if a first item  
3 in said plurality is a file or a directory (fig. 5, col. 9, lines 4-27)." This remark by the  
4 Examiner appears to be unsupported by the cited text for the following reasons.

5 Sherman's FIG. 5 is an example of a folder hierarchy. Specifically, FIG. 5 discloses  
6 at hierarchy LEVEL<sub>1</sub> a folder 200 which represents a root or top-level folder. Sherman's  
7 folder 200 contains multiple subfolders 202, 204 and 206 that are respectively named  
8 "FOLDER-1", "FOLDER-2" and "FOLDER-N" and together constitute Sherman's  
9 hierarchy LEVEL<sub>2</sub>. Each of subfolders 202, 204 and 206 itself has, at hierarchy LEVEL<sub>3</sub>,  
10 additional subfolders, such as three subfolders 208, 210 and 212 for subfolder 202, two  
11 subfolders 214 and 216 for subfolder 204 and subfolder 218 for subfolder 206. Finally, at  
12 hierarchy LEVEL<sub>4</sub>, there are shown in FIG. 5, two subfolders 220 and 222 contained in  
13 subfolder 210 and one subfolder 224 contained within subfolder 212.

14 As discussed above, Sherman's FIG. 5 appears to disclose a data structure alone,  
15 without disclosing any function, method or process whatsoever is disclosed by this figure.

16 Even assuming that a step of checking is disclosed in Sherman's FIG. 5 (it is not  
17 because there is only structure, no steps), there appears to be no disclosure of checking if an  
18 item is a file or a directory, at least not in FIG. 5 by itself.

19 Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner-cited text at column 9, lines 4-27  
20 does not overcome the above-noted defect, as seen from the following quotation:

21 The folder hierarchy illustrated in FIG. 5 represents a typical  
22 hierarchy that is created by the user on a server or desktop computer.  
23 When the user connects a companion device (such as an H/PC) to the  
24 server or desktop computer, a subset or the entire set of folders may be  
25 synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify which folders  
26 are to be synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder.  
27 That is, an "expanded" flag, which is set on a folder, pertains to the  
28 subfolder list of that folder and means that its subfolders will be  
29 synchronized. In this manner, the subfolders themselves are not  
30 necessarily individually marked in any way.

31  
32 Folders that are synchronized are thereby made available on the  
33 H/PC. The synchronization process also makes sure that any changes  
34 made to that folder list on either the device or the server are reconciled.  
35 As an example, a creation or deletion of a folder on the device while the

1 device was offline would be propagated to the server during  
2 synchronization. In the same way, creation or deletion of folder on the  
3 server would be propagated to the device during synchronization.  
4 Preferably, the synchronization process also synchronizes any folder  
5 rename operations. Moreover, other folder operations may be reconciled  
6 during the folder list synchronization.  
7

8 In the above-quoted text, Sherman discloses a hierarchy of folders and subfolders but the  
9 above-quoted text appears to be completely silent as to what, if any, checking is done.

10 Accordingly, there appears to be no disclosure in the above-quoted text nor in FIG. 5  
11 for checking if an item is a file or a directory. Also, nothing in the above-quoted text nor in  
12 FIG. 5 appears to perform different actions, depending on whether an item is a folder or not.

13 In view of the above-discussed remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this is a  
14 first reason why the §102 anticipation rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

15 In rejecting Claim 1 the Examiner further stated on page 3 of the Office Action, in  
16 paragraph 5 that Sherman teaches “the parent process in said computer copying the first item  
17 to at least one storage media if the first item is found during the checking to be a file and the  
18 parent process creating a child process in said computer if the first item is found during the  
19 checking to be a directory (i.e, 256-258, fig. 6, col. 9, lines 61-67 to col. 10, lines 1-38).”

20 This remark by the Examiner also appears to be unsupported by the cited text for the  
21 following reasons.

22 Sherman’s step 256 in FIG. 6 is to synchronize immediate subfolders of the folder,  
23 while Sherman’s step 258 is to check if the “expanded flag” is set on any subfolders. Note  
24 that Sherman’s synchronization in step 256 is itself conditioned on whether the “expanded  
25 flag” is set (checked in step 252). Step 258 checks if the expanded flag is set on any  
26 subfolders.

27 How the “expanded flag” is set is not shown in Sherman’s FIG. 6. Nor is this  
28 described in the Examiner-cited col. 9, lines 61-67 to col. 10, lines 1-38 (reproduced below).  
29 Instead, Sherman states elsewhere that an expanded flag may be set based on the user  
30 performing certain predetermined user actions for a particular subfolder. See column 7 line  
31 50 to column 8 line 3 and column 15, line 54 to column 16 line 5. Hence, Sherman’s  
32 synchronization appears to be done based on user activity or inactivity (or by default).

1 Steps 256 and 258 of Sherman's FIG. 6 which have been cited by the Examiner do  
2 not appear to treat folders and files differently. More specifically, there appears to be no  
3 disclosure in steps 256 and 258 of Sherman's FIG. 6 for checking if an item is a file or a  
4 directory. Also, nothing in the above-quoted text nor in FIG. 5 appears to perform different  
5 actions depending on whether an item is a folder or a file. More specifically, there appears  
6 to be no disclosure in steps 256 and 258 for copying an item if the item is found during  
7 checking to be a file.

8 Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner-cited text at column  
9 9, lines 61-67 to column 10, lines 1-38 does not overcome the above-noted defect, as seen  
10 from the following quotation (emphasis added):

11  
12 Returning now to FIG. 6, decision operation 258 checks each of  
13 the subfolders to determine the state of the expanded flag. For each of  
14 the expanded flags set, the operation flow branches YES to  
15 synchronization module 260. Each of the subfolders in that particular  
16 branch are recursively synchronized by module 260. For example, if at  
17 decision operation 258 it is determined that "expanded" flag is set on  
18 Folder-1202 of FIG. 5, the Level<sub>3</sub> Folders 208, 210 and 212 that are  
19 immediate subfolders of Folder-1202 will be synchronized. The  
20 recursive process continues down the branch associated with Folder-  
21 1202 to Level<sub>4</sub>, and further, if necessary, to synchronize all subfolders of  
22 the folders having an expanded flag set. When the folder branch has been  
23 synchronized in accordance with the state of the expanded flags,  
24 processing continues to branch test operation 262. Operation 262 tests  
25 for more branches. If there are more branches, testing of the expanded  
26 flag at operation 258 and the resultant synchronization at module 260  
27 continues. The More Branches operation 262 is used to illustrate the  
28 recursive nature of the synchronization operation. In essence, the  
29 **process must call itself** to determine whether more subfolders are to be  
30 synchronized depending on the state of the expanded flags. If more  
31 branches are detected at 262 that require synchronization as determined  
32 at 258 then process must flow to the synchronization stage 260. If there  
33 are no more branches to consider, the operation flow returns to decision  
34 operation 254.

35 A mail store is provided in the H/PC, and includes two separate  
36 databases: a message database, and a folder database. These two  
37 databases house the data records representing both the message and  
38 folder data within the user-defined, hierarchical folder architecture. In  
39 one embodiment of the invention, the expanded flag represents a field of  
40 the folder database in each database record. This field is then monitored

1 in each record to determine the state of the expanded flag associated with  
2 the corresponding folder. Testing of this folder database field is  
3 represented by decision operations 252 and 258 of FIG. 6. As more  
4 folders are synchronized, additional records are accordingly generated in  
5 the folder database. As will be appreciated by those skilled in the art,  
6 other manners of storing the expanded flag other than via a database field  
7 are possible, including mapped memory structures or other addressable  
8 storage structures whereby stored expanded flag indicators can be  
9 located.  
10

11 To summarize, there appears to be no support for the Examiner's remark that Sherman  
12 discloses in steps 256-258 of FIG. 6 and/or in the descriptive text at col. 9, lines 61-67 to  
13 col. 10, lines 1-38, copying an item if the item is found during checking to be a file. Hence,  
14 this is a second reason why the §102 rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

15 In the above-quoted text, Sherman states that his process calls itself (see emphasized  
16 text above, at line 7 of this page). Accordingly, it is appears that a single process, which  
17 checks an expanded flag for a folder, is used recursively by Sherman, to check on the  
18 expanded flags of subfolders. Hence, steps 256-258 of FIG. 6 and/or in the descriptive text  
19 at col. 9, lines 61-67 to col. 10, lines 1-38 of Sherman fail to disclose "the parent process  
20 creating a child process in said computer" as stated by the Examiner. Hence, this is a third  
21 reason why the §102 rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

22 Also, Sherman's use of the same process (see the phrase "call itself" emphasized in  
23 the above-quoted text) teaches away from creating a child process as per Claim 1.

24 In rejecting Claim 1 the Examiner also stated on page 3 of the Office Action, in  
25 paragraph 5 that Sherman teaches "if the first item is found during the checking to be a  
26 directory, the child process in said computer checking if another item in the directory  
27 represented by the first item is a file or a directory (fig. 5, fig. 6, col. 9, lines 4-67 to col. 10,  
28 lines 1-38)" This remark by the Examiner also appears to be unsupported by the cited text  
29 for the following reasons.

30 Sherman's fig. 5 and fig. 6, col. 9, lines 4-27, col. 9, lines 61-67 and col. 10, lines 1-  
31 38 have been discussed above. To re-state the arguments made above, there appears to be  
32 no support in the just-described text and figures of Sherman, for a child process checking if  
33 something is a file or a directory. Note that the remainder of the Examiner-cited text,  
34 namely Sherman's col. 9, lines 28-60 fails to overcome the above-noted defect. Instead,

1 Sherman's col. 9, lines 28-60 merely discusses synchronization based on the expanded flag  
2 (discussed above).

3 In rejecting Claim 1 the Examiner further stated on page 3 of the Office Action, in  
4 paragraph 5 that Sherman teaches "if the first item is found during the checking to be a file,  
5 the parent process in said computer checking if a second item in said plurality is a file or a  
6 directory; wherein at least one item in said plurality of items is copied to said at least one  
7 storage media (col. 2, lines 22-67, fig. 5, fig. 6, col. 9, lines 4-67 to col. 10, lines 1-38)."  
8 This remark by the Examiner also appears to be unsupported by the cited text for the  
9 following reasons.

10 Sherman's fig. 5 and fig. 6, col. 9, lines 4-67 to col. 10, lines 1-38 have been  
11 discussed above. To re-state the arguments made above, there appears to be no support in  
12 the just-described text and figures of Sherman, for a parent process checking if something is  
13 a file or a directory. Note that the remainder of the Examiner-cited text, namely Sherman's  
14 col. 2, lines 22-67 fails to overcome the above-noted defect. Instead, Sherman's col. 2, lines  
15 22-67 is merely the summary of the invention, as reproduced below.

16  
17 The present invention is generally directed to a manner of  
18 synchronizing information between computer systems, such as between  
19 client and server computer systems. The invention allows certain subsets  
20 of information to be synchronized, while excluding other information  
21 from the synchronization process. In accordance with the invention, the  
22 determination of which information subset is to be synchronized does not  
23 require explicit designation by the user. Rather, the information to be  
24 synchronized is ascertained through actions of the user that implicitly  
25 indicate the user's interest in that information, thereby allowing for the  
26 intuitive "assumption" that the user would want that information  
27 synchronized. Therefore, no action other than the user's normal activity  
28 in connection with the computer system is required to identify items for  
29 synchronization.

30 One aspect of the invention allows subsets of an object set to be  
31 synchronized between multiple computing systems. The object set is a  
32 set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder  
33 hierarchy. Predetermined user actions that implicitly reveal the user's  
34 desire to synchronize certain objects are defined. When the user, during  
35 normal operation of one of the computing systems, performs an action  
36 corresponding to one of the predetermined user actions, a  
37 synchronization indicator is assigned to the object or objects associated  
38 with this implicit synchronization directive. Only objects belonging to

1 the subset of objects that have been assigned a synchronization indicator  
2 are synchronized, to the exclusion of other objects in the object set.

3 The intuitive characteristic of the invention's selective  
4 synchronization process can be applied to a wide variety of  
5 synchronizable information. One aspect of the invention includes  
6 applying the selective synchronization process to an e-mail folder  
7 hierarchy. The subsets of the e-mail folder hierarchy are synchronized  
8 between computing systems, such as a server and a client or  
9 "companion" device. Predetermined user actions that implicitly  
10 demonstrate the user's desire to synchronize particular folders of the  
11 hierarchy are defined, and when the user performs one of these  
12 predetermined actions, those particular folders are flagged as part of the  
13 subset of folders to be synchronized between the server and client. In this  
14 manner, only the folder subset that is determined by one of these actions  
15 to be of interest to the user, rather than the entire folder hierarchy, is  
16 synchronized. This is accomplished without requiring the user's explicit  
17 identification of the subset of folders to be synchronized.  
18

19 Nothing in the above-quoted text by Sherman discloses a parent process checking if a first  
20 item is a file or a directory, copying the first item if it is a file and creating a child process if  
21 the first item is a directory. The above-quoted text further fails to disclose the child process  
22 checking if a second item in the directory represented by the first item is a file or a directory  
23 and if the first item is found to be a file, the parent process checking if a second item is a file  
24 or a directory.

25 Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Sherman.  
26 Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 4-19, 34,  
27 36, 38 and 39 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and are therefore, likewise  
28 patentable for at least the same reasons. Moreover, Claims 29-33, 45 and 48-57 recite one  
29 or more limitations similar (but not identical) to Claim 1 and are also believed to be  
30 patentable for one or more similar reasons.

31 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 1 in a future office action over Sherman,  
32 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in Sherman's patent is  
33 being analogized to Claim 1's "parent process" and which other item in Sherman's patent is  
34 analogized to Claim 1's "child process." The Examiner is further requested to identify  
35 which item in Sherman's patent is being analogized to Claim 1's "file." The lack of such

1 explicit mapping between Sherman's items and Claim 1's limitations in the current Office  
2 Action has made it difficult for the undersigned to respond properly.

3 In the current Office Action, Claim 4 stands rejected, with the Examiner citing only  
4 the above-quoted text from Sherman's col. 2, lines 22-67, fig. 5 and fig. 6, col. 9, lines 4-67  
5 to col. 10, lines 1-38, which have been discussed above. However, the Examiner-cited text  
6 appears to be completely silent, as to comparing a current number of processes, created for  
7 copying, with a limit and waiting if the current number is greater than or equal to the limit.  
8 So, Claim 4 is patentable over Sherman's patent for at least this additional reason.

9 Note that Applicant is traversing the Examiner's citation to Sherman's column col. 2,  
10 lines 22-67, fig. 5 and fig. 6, col. 9, lines 4-67 to col. 10, lines 1-38, in support of the  
11 anticipation rejection of Claim 4. If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 4 in a future  
12 office action over Sherman, the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific  
13 item in the Examiner-cited text by Sherman is analogized to Claim 4's "current number of  
14 processes" and which other item in the above-quoted text is analogized to Claim 4's "limit."  
15 The Examiner is further requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited text  
16 by Sherman is analogized to Claim 4's "comparing" and which other step in the Examiner-  
17 cited text by Sherman is analogized to Claim 4's "waiting."

18 The rejection of Claim 5 was explained by the Examiner at the top of page 4 of the  
19 Office Action by citation to Sherman's column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13 that are  
20 reproduced below:

21  
22 FIG. 2 provides a general description of an example computing  
23 environment in which the invention may be implemented. Various  
24 embodiments of the invention may be implemented by executing  
25 program instructions in this type of computing environment, such as the  
26 H/PC 22. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the invention may  
27 be practiced with other computer system configurations, such as laptop  
28 PCs, desktop PCs, multiprocessor systems, microprocessor-based or  
29 programmable consumer electronics, network PCs, mini-computers,  
30 mainframe computers, and so forth.

31 The computing system 34 (e.g., H/PC) illustrated in FIG. 2  
32 includes a computer 36 having at least one central processing unit (CPU)  
33 38 with a memory system 40, an input device 42, and an output device  
34 44. These elements are coupled by at least one system bus 46. The  
35 system bus 46 may be any of several types of bus structures such as a  
36 memory bus, a peripheral bus or a local bus using any of a variety of bus



1 architectures. The CPU 38 is of familiar design and includes an  
2 Arithmetic Logic Unit (ALU) 50 for performing computations, a  
3 collection of registers for temporary storage of data and instructions, and  
4 a control unit 52 for controlling operation of the system 34. The CPU 38  
5 may be a microprocessor having any of a variety of architectures  
6 including, but not limited to those architectures currently produced by  
7 Intel, Cyrix, AMD, IBM and Motorola.

8 The system memory 40 includes a main memory 54, which may  
9 include both volatile and non-volatile memory, such as random access  
10 memory (RAM) and read-only memory (ROM). The system memory 40  
11 may also include secondary storage 56 in the form of long-term storage  
12 mediums such as hard disks, floppy disks, tape, compact disks (CDs),  
13 flash memory, and other devices that store data using electrical,  
14 magnetic, optical or other recording media. The main memory 54 may  
15 also include video display memory for displaying images through the  
16 output device 44, such as a display device. The memory can comprise a  
17 variety of alternative components having a variety of storage capacities  
18 such as magnetic cassettes, memory cards, video digital disks, Bernoulli  
19 cartridges, random access memories, read-only memories and the like  
20 may also be used in the exemplary operating environment. Memory  
21 devices within the memory system and their associated computer  
22 readable media provide non-volatile storage of computer readable  
23 instructions, data structures, programs and other data for the computer  
24 system.

25 The input devices may include a keyboard, a mouse, a  
26 microphone, a touch pad, a touch screen, voice-recognition system, etc.  
27 The output devices may include a display, a printer, a speaker, a touch  
28 screen, etc. Some devices, such as a network interface or a modem can  
29 be used as input and/or output devices. The input and output devices are  
30 connected to the computer through system buses 46.

31 The computer system further includes an operating system and  
32 usually one or more application programs. The operating system  
33 comprises a set of programs that control the operation of the system 34,  
34 control the allocation of resources, provide a graphical user interface to  
35 the user and includes accessory and utility programs. An example of an  
36 operating system that can run on the handheld computer is the  
37 "WINDOWS CE" operating system, which also is commercially  
38 available from Microsoft Corporation. An application program is  
39 software that runs on top of the operating system software, and uses  
40 computer resources made available through the operating system to  
41 perform application-specific tasks desired by the user. While the present  
42 invention may be integrated into the operating system software, a  
43 preferred embodiment provides for its implementation in an application  
44 program as described more fully in connection with FIG. 3 below.  
45

1 The above-quoted text from Sherman discloses generic hardware and software which  
2 are used to implement Sherman's invention. There appears to be no disclosure in the above-  
3 quoted text to use a parent process and a child process. More specifically, there appears to  
4 be no disclosure in the above-quoted text of a parent process increasing a limit on a  
5 resource, followed by the child process using the resource at the increased limit in copying.  
6 Hence, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 5 is respectfully traversed. Claims 6-10 depend  
7 from Claim 5 and are distinguishable over Sherman for at least the same reason as Claim 5.

8 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 5 in a future office action over Sherman,  
9 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
10 text is analogized to Claim 5's "limit".

11 In rejecting Claim 6, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from Sherman's  
12 column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text appears to be  
13 completely silent, as to increasing a limit on the number of open files. More specifically,  
14 there appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of a parent process increasing the limit on the  
15 number of open files, followed by the child process using the increased limit on number of  
16 open files in copying. So, Claim 6 is patentable over Sherman's patent for at least this  
17 additional reason.

18 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 6 in a future office action over Sherman,  
19 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
20 text is analogized to Claim 6's "number of open files".

21 In rejecting Claim 7, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from Sherman's  
22 column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text appears to be  
23 completely silent, as to increasing a limit on the file size. More specifically, there appears to  
24 be no disclosure by Sherman of a parent process increasing the limit on the size of a file,  
25 followed by the child process using the increased file size limit in copying. Claim 7 is  
26 believed to be patentable over Sherman's patent for at least this additional reason.

27 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 7 in a future office action over Sherman,  
28 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
29 text is analogized to Claim 7's "file size".

30 In rejecting Claim 8, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from Sherman's  
31 column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text appears to be

1 completely silent, as to increasing a limit on memory. More specifically, there appears to be  
2 no disclosure by Sherman of a parent process increasing the limit on memory, followed by  
3 the child process using the increased memory limit in copying. Claim 8 is believed to be  
4 patentable over Sherman's patent for at least this additional reason.

5 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 8 in a future office action over Sherman,  
6 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
7 text is analogized to Claim 8's "memory" with an increased limit.

8 In rejecting Claim 9, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from Sherman's  
9 column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text appears to be  
10 completely silent, as to increasing a limit on a stack. More specifically, there appears to be  
11 no disclosure by Sherman of a parent process increasing the limit on a stack, followed by the  
12 child process using the increased stack limit in copying. Claim 9 is believed to be patentable  
13 over Sherman's patent for at least this additional reason.

14 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 9 in a future office action over Sherman,  
15 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
16 text is analogized to Claim 9's "stack" with an increased limit.

17 In rejecting Claim 10, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from  
18 Sherman's column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text  
19 appears to be completely silent, as to increasing a limit on a heap. More specifically, there  
20 appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of a parent process increasing the limit on a heap,  
21 followed by the child process using the increased heap limit in copying. Claim 10 is  
22 believed to be patentable over Sherman's patent for at least this additional reason.

23 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 10 in a future office action over Sherman,  
24 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
25 text is analogized to Claim 10's "heap" with an increased limit.

26 In rejecting Claim 11, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from  
27 Sherman's column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text  
28 appears to be completely silent, as to (a) a temporary buffer; and (b) DMA. More  
29 specifically, there appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of transferring data from a file  
30 into a temporary buffer, locking the temporary buffer, and invoking a direct memory access

1 (DMA) process for making a copy from the temporary buffer. Claim 11 is believed to be  
2 patentable over Sherman's patent for at least this additional reason.

3 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 11 in a future office action over Sherman,  
4 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
5 text is analogized to Claim 11's "temporary buffer" and which item of Sherman is  
6 analogized to Claim 11's "file." The Examiner is further requested to identify which item in  
7 the above-quoted text is analogized to Claim 11's DMA process.

8 In rejecting Claim 12, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from  
9 Sherman's column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text  
10 appears to be completely silent, as to a link to itself. More specifically, there appears to be  
11 no disclosure by Sherman of a parent process checking if a first item is a link to itself, and  
12 performing copying only if the first item is not a link to itself. Claim 12 is believed to be  
13 patentable over Sherman's patent for at least this additional reason. Claim 13 depends from  
14 Claim 12 and is distinguishable over Sherman for at least the same reason as Claim 12.

15 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 12 in a future office action over Sherman,  
16 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the above-quoted  
17 text is analogized to Claim 12's "link to itself".

18 In rejecting Claim 13, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from  
19 Sherman's column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text  
20 appears to be completely silent, as to a string comparison. More specifically, there appears  
21 to be no disclosure by Sherman of a parent process checking if a first item is a link to itself  
22 by a string comparison operation. Claim 13 is believed to be patentable over Sherman's  
23 patent for at least this additional reason.

24 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 13 in a future office action over Sherman,  
25 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the above-quoted  
26 text is analogized to Claim 13's "string comparison".

27 In rejecting Claim 14, the Examiner cited only the above-quoted text from  
28 Sherman's column 5, lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13. However, the Examiner-cited text  
29 appears to be completely silent, as to sending of an email message. Specifically, Sherman  
30 does not appear to disclose anywhere in the Examiner-cited text against Claim 14, a parent

1 process sending an email message if a resource at a destination is full, wherein the email  
2 message is sent to an email address of a user that started the method.

3 Note that Applicant is traversing the Examiner's citation to Sherman's column 5,  
4 lines 10-67 to col. 6, lines 1-13 in support of the anticipation rejection of Claim 14. If the  
5 Examiner continues to reject Claim 14 in a future office action over Sherman, the Examiner  
6 is respectfully requested to identify which condition in the Examiner-cited text by Sherman  
7 is analogized to Claim 14's "if a resource at a destination is full" and which item in the  
8 Examiner-cited text by Sherman is analogized to Claim 14's "email address of a user that  
9 started the method."

10 In rejecting Claim 15, the Examiner cited Sherman's "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8,  
11 lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." See the bottom of page 5 of the Office Action. This  
12 citation appears to have a typographical error ("typo") because col. 8 is cited redundantly.  
13 The undersigned has reviewed col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 of Sherman and is  
14 unable to find any support for the Examiner's position. Specifically, the Examiner-cited text  
15 appears to be completely silent, as to waiting during copying. More specifically, there  
16 appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of any process waiting to be restarted subsequent to  
17 sending an email message. Claim 15 is believed to be patentable over Sherman's patent for  
18 at least this additional reason. Claims 16 and 17 depend from Claim 15 and are  
19 distinguishable over Sherman for at least the same reason as Claim 15.

20 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 15 in a future office action over Sherman,  
21 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited  
22 text is analogized to Claim 15's "waiting."

23 In rejecting Claim 16, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
24 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." The  
25 Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position. Specifically, the  
26 Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent, as to suspending execution. More  
27 specifically, there appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of anything sending a signal to  
28 self to suspend execution. Claim 16 is believed to be patentable over Sherman's patent for at  
29 least this additional reason.

30 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 16 in a future office action over Sherman,  
31 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited

1 text is analogized to Claim 16's "suspend execution" and further identify which other step in  
2 the Examiner-cited text is analogized to Claim 16's "signal to self."

3 In rejecting Claim 17, the Examiner also cited to the above-discussed text from  
4 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
5 Claim 17 as well, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's  
6 position. Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent, as to  
7 recopying anything. More specifically, there appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of  
8 recopying a file from beginning, and doing so on being restarted. Claim 17 is believed to be  
9 patentable over Sherman's patent for at least these additional reasons.

10 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 17 in a future office action over Sherman,  
11 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited  
12 text is analogized to Claim 17's "recopying" and which other step in the Examiner-cited text  
13 is analogized to Claim 17's "restarted."

14 In rejecting Claim 18, the Examiner also cited to the above-discussed text from  
15 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
16 Claim 18 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
17 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent, as to any password.  
18 More specifically, there appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of using a password file to  
19 identify an email address, and doing so based on an identity of the user. Claim 18 is  
20 believed to be patentable over Sherman's patent for at least these additional reasons.

21 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 18 in a future office action over Sherman,  
22 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the Examiner-cited  
23 text is analogized to Claim 18's "password file," which item in the Examiner-cited text is  
24 analogized to Claim 18's "email address" and which other item is analogized to Claim 18's  
25 "identity of the user."

26 In rejecting Claim 19, the Examiner also cited to the above-discussed text from  
27 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
28 Claim 19 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
29 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent, as to creating. More  
30 specifically, there appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of creating a child process, and

1 doing so only if the directory is not a current directory and not a parent directory. Claim 19  
2 is believed to be patentable over Sherman's patent for at least these additional reasons.

3 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 19 in a future office action over Sherman,  
4 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited  
5 text is analogized to Claim 19's "creating" and which other step in the Examiner-cited text is  
6 analogized to Claim 19's condition "only if said directory is not ..."

7 In rejecting Claim 30, the Examiner also cited to the above-discussed text from  
8 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
9 Claim 30 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
10 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent, as to encountering any  
11 error. More specifically, there appears to be no disclosure by Sherman of sending an email  
12 message on encountering an error. Claim 30 is believed to be patentable over Sherman's  
13 patent for at least these additional reasons.

14 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 30 in a future office action over Sherman,  
15 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited  
16 text is analogized to Claim 30's "error" and which other step in the Examiner-cited text is  
17 analogized to Claim 30's "sending an email message if the means for copying encounters an  
18 error."

19 In rejecting Claim 31, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
20 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
21 Claim 31 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
22 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about increasing a limit  
23 on a resource to a maximum. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 31 is respectfully  
24 traversed.

25 In rejecting Claim 32, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
26 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
27 Claim 32 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
28 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about any temporary  
29 buffers, locking and DMA. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 32 is respectfully  
30 traversed.

1           If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 32 in a future office action over Sherman,  
2 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited  
3 text is analogized to Claim 32's "locking."

4           In rejecting Claim 33, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
5 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
6 Claim 33 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
7 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about checking if the  
8 item is a link to itself. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 33 is respectfully traversed.

9           In rejecting Claim 34, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
10 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
11 Claim 34 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
12 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about an instruction to  
13 perform the method for each item in the directory. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of  
14 Claim 34 is respectfully traversed.

15           In rejecting Claim 36, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
16 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
17 Claim 36 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
18 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about the number of  
19 processes created, and furthermore also completely silent about the number of directories to  
20 be copied. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 36 is respectfully traversed.

21           If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 36 in a future office action over Sherman,  
22 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the Examiner-cited  
23 text is analogized to Claim 36's "number of processes." The Examiner is further requested  
24 to identify which other item in the Examiner-cited text is analogized to Claim 36's "number  
25 of directories."

26           In rejecting Claim 38, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
27 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
28 Claim 38 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
29 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about checking if a file  
30 is in a list of items to be excluded from copying, and furthermore also completely silent



1 about performing copying only if the file is not in the list. Hence, the Examiner's rejection  
2 of Claim 38 is respectfully traversed.

3 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 38 in a future office action over Sherman,  
4 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the Examiner-cited  
5 text is analogized to Claim 38's "list" of excluded items. The Examiner is further requested  
6 to identify which step in the Examiner-cited text is analogized to Claim 38's "checking"  
7 and which other step is analogized to Claim 38's "performing."

8 In rejecting Claim 39, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
9 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
10 Claim 39 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
11 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about the file being  
12 copied to multiple destinations if specified by the user. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of  
13 Claim 39 is respectfully traversed.

14 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 39 in a future office action over Sherman,  
15 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific item in the Examiner-cited  
16 text is analogized to Claim 39's "multiple destinations". The Examiner is further requested  
17 to identify which step in the Examiner-cited text is analogized to Claim 39's "specified by  
18 the user."

19 In rejecting Claim 45, the Examiner cited to the above-discussed text from  
20 Sherman's patent, i.e. "col. 7, lines 24-67 to col. 8, lines 1-67 to col. 8, lines 1-65." For  
21 Claim 45 also, the Examiner-cited text does not appear to support the Examiner's position.  
22 Specifically, the Examiner-cited text appears to be completely silent about recursively  
23 spawning new processes. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 45 is respectfully  
24 traversed.

25 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 45 in a future office action over Sherman,  
26 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in the Examiner-cited  
27 text is analogized to Claim 45's current process that "calls a function to recursively spawn a  
28 plurality of new processes." The Examiner is further requested to identify which other step  
29 in the Examiner-cited text is analogized to Claim 45's current process waiting "for all new  
30 processes to finish."

1 In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner did not articulate any specific  
2 reason for the rejection of Claim 48. Hence, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 48 is  
3 respectfully traversed as being an "omnibus" rejection that is unsupported by any citation to  
4 Sherman's patent.

5 If the Examiner continues to reject Claim 48 in a future office action over Sherman,  
6 the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify which specific step in Sherman's patent is  
7 analogized to Claim 48's "child process creating another child process." The Examiner is  
8 further requested to identify which other step in Sherman's patent is analogized to Claim  
9 48's parent process creating a yet another child process.

10 Note that several of the claims that have not been expressly discussed above, are  
11 believed to be patentable over Sherman for reasons similar to those discussed above for  
12 other claims. For example, Claim 50 is believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those  
13 discussed above for Claims 12 and/or 33. As another example, Claim 53 is believed to be  
14 patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above for Claims 5 and/or 31. As still  
15 another example, Claim 54 is believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those discussed  
16 above for Claim 38.

17 New Claims 55-57 are added herewith, based on the limitations in Claims 6, 7 and 8  
18 respectively, and are believed to be patentable for similar reasons.

19 For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending  
20 claims. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is  
21 invited to call the undersigned at (408) 378-7777 ext 113.  
22

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-WEB TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to via the USPTO Electronic Filing System on the below date.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

November 21, 2008

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Omkar K. Suryadevara  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 36320